

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/564,095	01/11/2006	Yuhji Andoh	2936-0260PUS1	7167	
2292	7590 11/17/2006		EXAMINER		
BIRCH STE	EWART KOLASCH & B	PELHAM, JOS	PELHAM, JOSEPH MOORE		
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		3742		
			DATE MAILED: 11/17/2006	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8	

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/564,095	ANDOH ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joseph M. Pelham	3742	
- The MAILING DATE of this communicati r Reply	on appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address	

	Joseph M. Pelha	m	3742	·			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
Responsive to communication(s) filed on      This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This      Since this application is in condition for allowan closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-fin	rmal matters, pro		e merits is			
Disposition of Claims				•			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw  5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 3-7 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) 2 is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or							
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on 11 January 2006 is/are:  Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the original of the correction of the original of the correction of the original original original or the correction of the original orig	a)⊠ accepted drawing(s) be held on is required if th	l in abeyance. See le drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 C	FR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>							
Attachment(s)							
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/11/06.</li> </ol>	4)	Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da Notice of Informal P Other:	ate				

Application/Control Number: 10/564,095

Art Unit: 3742

#### **Double Patenting**

Page 2

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1 and 3-7 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/568,457. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other, because apart from broadening the scope of claim 1 of 10/568,457, instant claims 1 and 3-7 differ only by specifying that steam is introduced into the external circulation path downstream of the blower, a circular pipe for the external circulation path, a centrifugal fan and a DC fan motor. However, a circular pipe and introducing steam downstream of the blower are both conventional, and commended respectively by the availability of such piping and the maximum air speed and therefore vacuum suction strength downstream of a blower.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat. 5802963.

Referring to Figs. 1-3 and col. 5, line 8, through col. 6, line 44, US'963 discloses a steam oven as claimed, including an external circulation path 19 with a blowhole 15 from which gas flows to strike the foods in the chamber, a centrifugal fan 20, and a steam ejector 34 downstream of the fan.

Art Unit: 3742

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 3 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US'963.

While US'963 does not explicitly disclose a circular pipe for the external circulation path and a DC fan motor, these features do not patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. It would have been obvious to utilize a circular pipe by reason of its prefabricated availability and resulting economy of manufacturing costs, and to utilize a DC motor depending strictly on the environment in which it is intended to be used, i.e., whether DC is readily available and the electromagnetic emissions of AC are undesirable.

### Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 2 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph M. Pelham whose telephone number is 571-272-4786. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robin Evans can be reached on 571-272-4777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

10/31/06

JOSEPH PELHAM PRIMARY EXAMINES